arXiv:math/0505076v2 [math.RT] 4 Nov 2005

Killing of supports on graded algebras

Roberto Martínez Villa
Instituto de Matemáticas, UNAM, AP 61-3
58089 Morelia, Michoacán
MEXICO
mvilla@matmor.unam.mx

Manuel Saorín
Departamento de Matemáticas
Universidad de Murcia, Aptdo. 4021
30100 Espinardo, Murcia
SPAIN
msaorinc@um.es

Abstract

Killing of supports along subsets $\mathcal{U}$ of a group G and regradings along certain maps of groups $\varphi : G' \longrightarrow G$ are studied, in the context of group-graded algebras. We show that, under precise conditions on $\mathcal{U}$ and φ, the module theories over the initial and the final algebras are functorially well-connected. Special attention is paid to $G = \mathbf{Z}$, in which case the results can be applied to n-Koszul algebras

1 Introduction

In a recent paper ([5], see also [3]), the authors showed that if Λ is a n-Koszul graded algebra and $\Lambda^!$ is its n-homogeneous dual, then the Yoneda algebra $E = E(\Lambda)$ of Λ is obtained as follows. One takes $\mathcal{U} = n\mathbf{Z} \cup (n\mathbf{Z} + 1)$, kills the part of the support of $\Lambda^!$ in $\mathbf{Z} \setminus \mathcal{U}$ and then obtains a new $\mathbf{Z}$-graded algebra $\Lambda^!_{\mathcal{U}}$ by keeping the same multiplication of homogeneous elements, when its degree falls into $\mathcal{U}$, and making it zero otherwise. Then E is obtained from $\Lambda^!_{\mathcal{U}}$ by regrading along certain function $\delta : \mathbf{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ which has image $Im(\delta) = \mathcal{U}$.

Motivated by the above fact, we consider an arbitrary subset $\mathcal{U}$ of a group G and define a multiplication of nonzero homogeneous elements on $A_{\mathcal{U}} = \oplus_{u \in \mathcal{U}} A_u$

---

[*] The first named author thanks CONACYT for funding the research project. The second one thanks the D.G.I. of the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science and the Fundación "Séneca" of Murcia for their financial support

by the rule $a \cdot b = ab$, in case $deg(a)deg(b) \in \mathcal{U}$, and $a \cdot b = 0$ otherwise. We then extend by linearity and call this operation the **support-restricted multiplication** on $A_{\mathcal{U}}$. In this situation, we try to answer the following:

Question 1.1. *When is it true that, for every G-graded algebra $A = \oplus_{g \in G} A_g$, the subspace $A_{\mathcal{U}} = \oplus_{u \in \mathcal{U}} A_u$ inherites a structure of G-graded algebra with the support-restricted multiplication?. For such a $\mathcal{U}$, how are connected the graded module theories of A and $A_{\mathcal{U}}$?*

Also, concerning regradings, we try to answer the following:

Question 1.2. *Let G', G be groups and $\varphi : G' \longrightarrow G$ be a map. When is it true that, for every G-graded algebra $B = \oplus_{g \in G} B_g$ with support contained in $Im(\varphi)$, taking $\tilde{B}_\sigma = B_{\varphi(\sigma)}$, for every $\sigma \in G'$, gives rise to a G'-graded algebra $\tilde{B}$ which coincides with B as ungraded algebra?. In that case, how are connected the graded module theories of B and the (regraded) $\tilde{B}$?*

The structure of the paper goes as follows. In Section 2, we show that the answer to Question 1.1 is: 'when $\mathcal{U}$ is a ring-supporting subset (see definition below) of G' (cf. Proposition 2.2). We then introduce the concept of (right) modular pair of subsets (see Definition 1) of G. If $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ is such a pair, in which case $\mathcal{U}$ is ring-supporting, then the assigment $M \rightsquigarrow M_{\mathcal{S}}$ gives an exact functor $(-)_{\mathcal{S}} : Gr_A \longrightarrow Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$, which is fully faithful when restricted to a well-described subcategory $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ (Theorem 2.7). The essential image of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ by $(-)_{\mathcal{S}}$, denoted $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$, contains all the graded $A_{\mathcal{U}}$-modules presented in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) = \{g \in G : g\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{S}\}$. In Section 3, we show that the answer to Question 1.2 is: 'when φ is a pseudomorphism of groups'. Then we show that there is an equivalence between the category $\Sigma_{Im(\varphi)}$ of G-graded B-modules X with support $Supp(X) \subseteq Im(\varphi)$ and the category $\tilde{\Sigma}_{Im(\varphi)}$ of G'-graded $\tilde{B}$-modules V such that $V_\sigma \tilde{B}_\tau = 0$ whenever $\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau) \notin Im(\varphi)$ (cf. Proposition 3.1). We then mix both questions, namely, study the case when $\mathcal{U}$ is a ring-supporting subset of G which is the image of a pseudomorphism $\varphi : G' \longrightarrow G$. Then, passing from A to $B = A_{\mathcal{U}}$ and from B to $\tilde{B}$, we obtain an equivalence of categories between the subcategory $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ of Gr_A and a full subcategory $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}$ of $Gr_{\tilde{B}}$ (Proposition 3.2).

In Section 4, we study the ring-supporting subsets $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}$ of the integers, giving essentially their structure (Theorem 4.2). Then precise criteria are given for a graded $A_{\mathcal{U}}$-module to belong to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$, criteria which are specially simple when $\mathcal{U}$ is the translation of an inverval (cf. Corollary 4.7). In addition, in this last case, $\mathcal{U}$ is the image of a precise pseudomorphism $\mathbf{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Z}$. Then, for a positively $\mathbf{Z}$-graded algebra $A = \oplus_{n \geq 0} A_n$, taking $B = A_{\mathcal{U}}$ and then the regraded $\tilde{B}$, we obtain a precise description of the subcategories $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}$ mentioned above. In case Λ is a n-Koszul algebra and $A = \Lambda^!$, the results can be applied to show equivalences between appropriate full subcategories of $Gr_{\Lambda^!}$ and Gr_E (cf. Remark 4.11).

All algebras in the paper are associative with unit and modules are right modules, unless explicitly said otherwise. Our basic reference for graded rings and modules will be [6], while the terminology concerning torsion theories in Grothendieck categories can be found in [7]. The few definitions and properties that we need about n-Koszul algebras can be found in [2] and [5]. For the non-defined terms concerning algebras and modules, we refer to [1].

2 Killing of supports and induced equivalences

In this and next section, we assume that R is a commutative ring, G is a group and $A = \underset{g\in G}{\oplus} A_g$ is a $G-$graded R-algebra. Let us fix a subset $\mathcal{S}$ of G and, for every graded A-module $M = \oplus_{g\in G} M_g$, put $M_{\mathcal{S}} = \oplus_{s\in\mathcal{S}} M_s$, letting $M_\emptyset = 0$. We take $\mathcal{T} =: \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}} = \{M \in Gr_A : Supp(M) \subseteq G \setminus \mathcal{S}\}$, where $Supp(M) = \{g \in G : M_g \neq 0\}$ is the support of M. It is a hereditary torsion class closed for products in Gr_A. We can view R as a G-graded ring, with $R_1 = R$ and $R_g = 0$ for $g \neq 1$, and then an object of Gr_R is just a family $(M_g)_{g\in G}$ of R-modules. We view $M_{\mathcal{S}}$ as an object of Gr_R, with $(M_{\mathcal{S}})_g = 0$ when $g \in G \setminus \mathcal{S}$.

Proposition 2.1. *The assignment $M \longrightarrow M_{\mathcal{S}}$ gives an exact functor, $(-)_{\mathcal{S}} : Gr_A \to Gr_R$ with kernel $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, the induced functor $Gr_A/\mathcal{T} \to Gr_R$ is faithful and identifies $Gr_A/\mathcal{T}$ with a (not necessarily full) subcategory of Gr_R.*

Proof. As a functor $Gr_A \longrightarrow Mod_R$, $M \rightsquigarrow M_s$, is exact, for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Consequently, the assignment $M \rightsquigarrow M_{\mathcal{S}}$ yields an exact functor: $Gr_A \to Gr_R$.

The kernel of $(-)_{\mathcal{S}}$ is $\{M \in Gr_A : M_{\mathcal{S}} = 0\} = \mathcal{T}$. Then the universal property of the quotient category (cf [4]) yields a unique R-linear functor $F : Gr_A/\mathcal{T} \longrightarrow Gr_R$ such that the diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Gr_A \arrow[rr, "(-)_{\mathcal{S}}"] \arrow[dr, "p"'] & & Gr_R \\
& Gr_A/\mathcal{T} \arrow[ur, "F"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative, where p is the canonical projection. All we need to check is that F is faithful. By [4], we have $Hom_{Gr_A/\mathcal{T}}(M,N) = \varinjlim_{N', M/M' \in \mathcal{T}} Hom_{Gr_A}(M', N/N')$.
Here the order in the index set is: $(M', N') \leq (M'', N'')$ iff $M'' \subseteq M'$ and $N' \subseteq N''$. In our situation we have a unique maximum in that set. Indeed, since $\mathcal{T}$ is closed for products and subobjects in Gr_A, we have that $\underset{M' \leq M, M/M' \in \mathcal{T}}{\cap} M' = \widetilde{M}$ is a graded submodule of M such that $M/\widetilde{M} \in \mathcal{T}$. On the other hand, $N' \subseteq t(N)$, where $t(N)$ is by definition the largest submodule of N belonging to $\mathcal{T}$.

Therefore $(M', N') \leq (\widetilde{M}, t(N))$ for all (M', N') in the index set.
Then $\mathrm{Hom}_{Gr_A/\mathcal{T}}(\mathrm{M,N}) = \mathrm{Hom}_{Gr_A}(\widetilde{\mathrm{M}}, \mathrm{N/t(N)})$.

In order to prove the faithful condition of F we need a more precise description of $\widetilde{M}$ and $t(N)$. Notice that if $M' \leq M$ is a graded submodule, then $M/M' \in \mathcal{T}$ iff $M_s = M'_s$ for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$ iff $M_{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq M'$. As a consequence, $\widetilde{M} = M_{\mathcal{S}}A$ is the graded $A-$ submodule of M generated by $M_{\mathcal{S}}$. On the other hand, in case $N' \leq N$, we have that $N' \in \mathcal{T}$ iff $N'_s = 0$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. As a consequence, $t(N)$ is the largest graded submodule of N contained in $N_{G \setminus \mathcal{S}}$. In particular, this implies that $N_{\mathcal{S}} = (N/\ t(N)_{\mathcal{S}}$.

Now the canonical map $Hom_{Gr_A}(M_{\mathcal{S}}A, N/t(N)) \to Hom_{Gr_R}(M_{\mathcal{S}}, N_{\mathcal{S}})$ maps $f \in Hom_{Gr_A}(M_{\mathcal{S}}A, N/t(N))$ onto $f_{|M_{\mathcal{S}}}$. If $F(f) = 0$, then $f_{|M_{\mathcal{S}}} = 0$ and, since $M_{\mathcal{S}}A$ is generated by $M_{\mathcal{S}}$ as A- module, $f = 0$. That proves the faithful condition of F.

□

An arbitrary killing of supports won't lead to a reasonably good module theory over a new graded algebra. We need to impose some restrictions.

Definition 1. *Let G be a group and $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ a pair of nonempty subsets of G such that $1 \in \mathcal{U}$. We shall say that $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ is a* **right premodular pair** *if whenever $(s,u,v) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}$ is a triple, with $suv \in \mathcal{S}$, one has that $su \in \mathcal{S}$ if, and only if, $uv \in \mathcal{U}$. By symmetry we get the notion of left premodular pair.*

A subset $\mathcal{U} \subseteq G$ containing 1 will be called **ring-supporting** *in case $(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U})$ is a (left or right) premodular pair. A* **right** *(resp.* **left***)* **modular pair** *is a right (resp. left) premodular pair such that $\mathcal{U}$ is ring-supporting.*

The terms above are justified by the following results.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq G$ be a subset of the group G. The following assertions are equivalent:*

1. *$\mathcal{U}$ is ring-supporting*
2. *For every G-graded algebra $A = \oplus_{g \in G} A_g$, the sub-bimodule $A_{\mathcal{U}} = \oplus_{u \in \mathcal{U}} A_u$ has a structure of G-graded R-algebra by putting $(A_{\mathcal{U}})_g = 0$, when $g \in G \setminus \mathcal{U}$, and considering the support-restricted multiplication.*

Proof. 1) $\Longrightarrow$ 2) The ring-supporting condition of $\mathcal{U}$ guarantees that the given multiplication in $A_{\mathcal{U}}$ is associative and, from that, it follows easily that $A_{\mathcal{U}}$ becomes a G-graded algebra.

2) $\Longrightarrow$ 1) Take the group algebra $A = RG$. Then $A_{\mathcal{U}} = R\mathcal{U} = \oplus_{u \in \mathcal{U}} Ru$. Denote by $\cdot$ the support-restricted multiplication on $R\mathcal{U}$. Since $R\mathcal{U}$ has an identity, necessarily $1 \in \mathcal{U}$. On the other hand, in case $u, v, w \in \mathcal{U}$ and $uvw \in \mathcal{U}$, one has $(u \cdot v) \cdot w = uvw$ exactly when $uv \in \mathcal{U}$, and $uvw = u \cdot (v \cdot w)$ exactly when $vw \in \mathcal{U}$. The associative property of $\cdot$ then gives that $uv \in \mathcal{U}$ if, and only if, $vw \in \mathcal{U}$. □

Proposition 2.3. *Let $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ be a pair of subsets of the group G, where $\mathcal{U}$ is ring-supporting. The following assertions are equivalent:*

1. *$(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ is right modular*

2. *For every G-graded algebra and every $M \in Gr_A$, the sub-bimodule $M_{\mathcal{S}} = \underset{s\in\mathcal{S}}{\oplus} M_s$ has a structure of graded right $A_{\mathcal{U}}-$ module by putting $(M_{\mathcal{S}})_g = 0$, when $g \in G \setminus \mathcal{S}$, and defining the exterior multiplication of nonzero homogeneous elements by: $x \cdot a = \begin{cases} xa & \text{if } \deg(x)deg(\ a) \in \mathcal{S} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$.*

In the above situation, the functor $(-)_{\mathcal{S}}$ of Proposition 2.1 may be viewed as an R-linear functor $Gr_A \longrightarrow Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$.

Proof. Along the lines of the previous proposition. □

We now give some properties of the just introduced subsets of a group. In case $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ is a pair of subsets of the group G, we shall put $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) = \{g \in G : g\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{S}\}$. If $1 \in \mathcal{U}$ then $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$ is a (possibly empty) subset of $\mathcal{S}$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let G be a group and $\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U}$ be nonempty subsets of G. The following assertions hold:*

1. *If $\mathcal{U}$ is ring-supporting, then $\mathcal{U}^{-1}$ is also ring-supporting*

2. *The pair $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ is right modular if, and only if, $(\mathcal{U}^{-1}, \mathcal{S}^{-1})$ is left modular.*

3. *$(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$ is left modular if, and only if, $(\mathcal{S}^{-1},\mathcal{U})$ is right modular*

4. *If $\mathcal{U}$ is ring-supporting then $(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U}^{-1})$ is left and right modular*

5. *If $1 \in \mathcal{U}$ then $(\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U})$ is a subgroup of G contained in $\mathcal{U}$ which, in case $\mathcal{U}$ is ring-supporting, coincides with $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{U}^{-1}$*

6. *If $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ is a right modular pair and $g \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$, then $\mathcal{S} = g\mathcal{U}$ and $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) = g(\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U})$*

Proof. We leave to the reader the easy verification of 1 and 2. In 3, by symmetry it will be enough to check one of the implications. Suppose then that $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$ is a left modular pair. We consider elements $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $u, v \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $s^{-1}uv \in \mathcal{S}^{-1}$ or, equivalently, $v^{-1}u^{-1}s \in \mathcal{S}$. We want to prove that $uv \in \mathcal{U}$ if, and only if, $s^{-1}u \in \mathcal{S}^{-1}$. That is, we want to prove that $uv \in \mathcal{U}$ if, and only if, $u^{-1}s \in \mathcal{S}$. But we have elements u, v in $\mathcal{U}$ and $v^{-1}u^{-1}s \in \mathcal{S}$ with product $uvv^{-1}u^{-1}s = s \in \mathcal{S}$. The left modularity of $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$ gives that $uv \in \mathcal{U}$ if, and only if, $vv^{-1}u^{-1}s = u^{-1}s \in \mathcal{S}$, as desired.

Assertion 4 follows from 2 and 3.

We prove now assertion 5. Clearly, $(\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U})$ is a subgroup of G contained in $\mathcal{U}$. Then $(\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U}) \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{U}^{-1}$. For the reverse inclusion in case $\mathcal{U}$ is ring-supporting, take $u \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{U}^{-1}$ and suppose that $u \notin (\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U})$. Then we have two possibilities: i) there exists a $v \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $uv \notin \mathcal{U}$; ii) there exists $w \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $w \notin u\mathcal{U}$. In case i) u^{-1}, u, v are elements of $\mathcal{U}$ with product $u^{-1}uv = v \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $u^{-1}u = 1 \in \mathcal{U}$, but $uv \notin \mathcal{U}$. That contradicts the ring-supporting condition of

$\mathcal{U}$. In case ii), we have that $u^{-1}w \notin \mathcal{U}$ and again we get elements $u, u^{-1}, w \in \mathcal{U}$ with product $uu^{-1}w = w \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $uu^{-1} = 1 \in \mathcal{U}$, but $u^{-1}w \notin \mathcal{U}$. That is a contradiction. Then u cannot exist, so that $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{U}^{-1} \subseteq (\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U})$ as desired.

The proof of assertion 6 is left to the reader. □

Lemma 2.5. *Let $A = \oplus_{g \in G} A_g$ be a G-graded algebra, $\mathcal{S} \subseteq G$ be a subset and put $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}$. The following assertions are equivalent for a graded A-module M:*

1. *M is $\mathcal{T}$-torsionfree (i.e. $Hom_{Gr_A}(T, M) = 0$, for all $T \in \mathcal{T}$)*
2. *For every nonzero graded submodule N of M, one has $N_{\mathcal{S}} \neq 0$*

Proof. If $T \in \mathcal{T}$ then $Supp(T) \subseteq G \setminus \mathcal{S}$. Hence M is $\mathcal{T}$-torsionfree if, and only if, for every nonzero graded submodule N of M, one has $Supp(N) \not\subseteq G \setminus \mathcal{S}$. □

If $M \in Gr_A$ satisfies the conditions of the above lemma, we shall indistinctly say that M is $\mathcal{T}$-torsionfree or that M is **cogenerated in degrees belonging to $\mathcal{S}$**. In case $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ is a right modular pair of subsets of G, the induced functor $F : Gr_A/\mathcal{T} \longrightarrow Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ is not full. We shall see that it is full when restricted to an appropriate full subcategory of $Gr_A/\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ be a right modular pair of subsets of the group G and $A = \oplus_{\sigma \in G} A_\sigma$ be a G-graded algebra. Suppose that $g \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$. Then we have a commutative diagram of functors:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Gr_A \arrow[r, "\cong"] \arrow[d, "(-)_{\mathcal{U}}"'] & Gr_A \arrow[d, "(-)_{\mathcal{S}}"] \\
Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}} \arrow[r, "\cong"'] & Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the horizontal arrows are the shifting equivalences $?[g^{-1}] : V \rightsquigarrow V[g^{-1}]$

Proof. We just need to prove that $M[g^{-1}]_{\mathcal{S}} = M_{\mathcal{U}}[g^{-1}]$, for every $M \in Gr_A$. Indeed $Supp(M_{\mathcal{U}}[g^{-1}]) = \{h \in G : g^{-1}h \in Supp(M_{\mathcal{U}})\}$, which is clearly contained in $g\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{S}$. Now if $s \in \mathcal{S}$ then $M[g^{-1}]_s = M_{g^{-1}s}$ while $M_{\mathcal{U}}[g^{-1}]_s = (M_{\mathcal{U}})_{g^{-1}s}$. But $(M_{\mathcal{U}})_{g^{-1}s} = M_{g^{-1}s}$ since $g^{-1}s \in \mathcal{U}$.

□

In order to give our next result we consider the full subcategory $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ of Gr_A with objects the graded A-modules generated in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$ and cogenerated in degrees belonging to $\mathcal{S}$ (i.e. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}$-torsionfree). On the other hand, the objects of the essential image of the functor $(-)_{\mathcal{S}} : Gr_A \longrightarrow Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ will be called **liftable** graded $A_{\mathcal{U}}$-modules with respect to $(-)_{\mathcal{S}}$. We shall denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ the full subcategory of $Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ with objects the liftable $A_{\mathcal{U}}$-modules generated in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$. A graded module (over any G-graded algebra) M will be called **presented in degrees belonging to $\mathcal{X} \subseteq G$**, when there is an exact sequence of graded modules $P \longrightarrow Q \twoheadrightarrow M \to 0$, with P, Q gr-projective and generated in degrees belonging to $\mathcal{X}$. We are now ready to prove:

Theorem 2.7. *Let $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ be a right modular pair of subsets of G and $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}$. The following assertions hold:*

1. *The composition $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U}) \hookrightarrow Gr_A \xrightarrow{p} Gr_A/\mathcal{T}$ is fully faithful*
2. *The restriction of $(-)_{\mathcal{S}}$ to $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ is a fully faithful functor which induces an equivalence of categories $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$*
3. *For every $g \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$, there is a commutative diagram of equivalences of categories:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U}) \arrow[r, "\cong"] \arrow[d, "(-)_{\mathcal{U}}"', "\cong"] & \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U}) \arrow[d, "\cong"', "(-)_{\mathcal{S}}"] \\
\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U}) \arrow[r, "\cong"'] & \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the horizontal arrows are the shifting equivalences $?[g^{-1}]$

Moreover, $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ contains all the graded $A_{\mathcal{U}}$-modules presented in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$

Proof. Let us take $M, N \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$. By the proof of Proposition 2.1, we know that $Hom_{Gr_A/\mathcal{T}}(M, N) = Hom_{Gr_A}(\tilde{M}, N/t(N))$, where $\tilde{M}$ is the A-submodule of M generated by $M_{\mathcal{S}}$. Since $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and M is generated in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$, we conclude that $\tilde{M} = M$. On the other hand, since N is torsionfree we get $t(N) = 0$ and, hence, $Hom_{Gr_A/\mathcal{T}}(M, N) = Hom_{Gr_A}(M, N)$, which proves assertion 1.

By assertion 1, we can view $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ as a full subcategory of $Gr_A/\mathcal{T}$, and then the restriction of $(-)_{\mathcal{S}}$ to $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$, which we denote by H in the sequel, can be identified with the restriction of $F : Gr_A/\mathcal{T} \longrightarrow Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ to $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$. Since F is faithful (cf. Proposition 2.1) H is faithful. We next prove that it is full. Let $M, N \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ and $M_{\mathcal{S}} \xrightarrow{g} N_{\mathcal{S}}$ be a morphism in $Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$. Notice that we have epimorphisms $\underset{i\in I}{\oplus} A\left[s_i^{-1}\right] \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_M} M$ and $\underset{j\in J}{\oplus} A\left[t_j^{-1}\right] \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_N} N$ in Gr_A, where $(s_i)_{i\in I}$ and $(t_j)_{j\in J}$ are families in $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$. From the proof of Lemma 2.6 we get that $A[g^{-1}]_{\mathcal{S}} = A_{\mathcal{U}}[g^{-1}]$, for every $g \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$. Then, by applying $(-)_{\mathcal{S}}$, we get epimorphisms $\underset{i\in I}{\oplus} A_{\mathcal{U}}\left[s_i^{-1}\right] \xrightarrow{\tilde{\varepsilon}_M} M_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\underset{j\in J}{\oplus} A_{\mathcal{U}}\left[t_j^{-1}\right] \xrightarrow{\tilde{\varepsilon}_N} N_{\mathcal{S}}$ in $Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ By the projective condition of $\underset{i\in I}{\oplus} A_{\mathcal{U}}\left[s_i^{-1}\right]$ in $Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ we get a commutative diagram in this latter category:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\underset{i\in I}{\oplus} A_{\mathcal{U}}\left[s_i^{-1}\right] \arrow[r, "\widetilde{\varepsilon}_M"] \arrow[d, "\phi"] & M_{\mathcal{S}} \arrow[d, "g"] \\
\underset{j\in J}{\oplus} A_{\mathcal{U}}\left[t_j^{-1}\right] \arrow[r, "\widetilde{\varepsilon}_N"] & N_{\mathcal{S}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Recall that $\underset{i\in I}{\oplus} A_{\mathcal{U}}\left[s_i^{-1}\right] = A_{\mathcal{U}}^{(I)}$ as ungraded right $A_{\mathcal{U}}-$ module, with the grading obtained by assigning degree s_i to the i-th element e_i of the canonical basis of $A_{\mathcal{U}}^{(I)}$ as $A_{\mathcal{U}}$ - module. Then $\phi(e_i)$ is an element of $\underset{j\in J}{\oplus} A_{\mathcal{U}}\left[t_j^{-1}\right]$ of degree s_i. i.e. $\phi(e_i) \in \underset{j\in J}{\oplus} A_{\mathcal{U}}\left[t_j^{-1}\right]_{s_i} = \underset{j\in J}{\oplus} A_{t_j^{-1}s_i}$. We define now $\bar{\phi} : \underset{i\in I}{\oplus} A\left[s_i^{-1}\right] \to \underset{j\in J}{\oplus} A\left[t_j^{-1}\right]$ as the only homomorphism of (graded) right A-modules such that $\bar{\phi}(e_i) = \phi(e_i)$ for all i.

This yields a diagram in Gr_A :

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\underset{i\in I}{\oplus} A\left[s_i^{-1}\right] \arrow[r, "\varepsilon_M"] \arrow[d, "\bar{\phi}"] & M \\
\underset{j\in J}{\oplus} A\left[t_j^{-1}\right] \arrow[r, "\varepsilon_N"] & N
\end{tikzcd}$$

We claim that $\varepsilon_N\bar{\phi}$ vanishes on $Ker\varepsilon_M$, which implies the existence of a unique morphism $f : M \to N$ in Gr_A such that $\varepsilon_N\bar{\phi} = f\varepsilon_M$. From that one easily gets that $f_{\mathcal{S}} = g$ and the full condition for H will follow. In order to prove our claim, let $x \in Ker\epsilon_M$ be a homogeneous element. If $\deg(x) \in \mathcal{S}$, then $x \in Ker(\widetilde{\varepsilon}_M)$, so that $\varepsilon_N\bar{\phi}(x) = \widetilde{\varepsilon}_N\phi(x) = g\widetilde{\varepsilon}_M(x) = 0$. In case $\deg(x) \notin \mathcal{S}$, we have $\deg((\varepsilon_N\bar{\phi})(x)) = \deg(x) \notin \mathcal{S}$. In either case, every element in $(\varepsilon_N\bar{\phi})(Ker\varepsilon_M)$ has support in $G \setminus \mathcal{S}$. This implies $(\varepsilon_N\bar{\phi})(Ker\varepsilon_M) \subseteq t(N) = 0$ as desired.

In order to end the proof of assertion 2, it only remains to prove that if $X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ then there is a $M \in Gr_A$ such that $M_{\mathcal{S}} = X$ and M is generated in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$. In that case, we could always assume that M is $\mathcal{T}$-torsionfree, so that $M \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$. Since X is liftable, we can fix a $N \in Gr_A$ such that $N_{\mathcal{S}} = X$. We take a family $(x_i)_{i\in I}$ of homogeneous generators of X, where $deg(x_i) =: s_i \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$ for all $i \in I$. Then $x_i \in X_{s_i} = N_{s_i}$ and we can consider $M = \sum_{i\in I} x_i A$, i.e., the graded A-submodule of N generated by the x_i. Then $X = \sum_{i\in I} x_i A_{\mathcal{U}} \subseteq M_{\mathcal{S}}$, due to the fact that $s_i \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$ for all $i \in I$. From that we get that $X \subseteq M_{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq N_{\mathcal{S}} = X$ and, hence, equalities. Then $M_{\mathcal{S}} = X$ as desired.

Assertion 3 follows directly from Lemma 2.6. For the final statement, notice that every gr-projective $A_{\mathcal{U}}$-module P generated in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$ is a direct summand of $\oplus_{i\in I} A_{\mathcal{U}}[g_i^{-1}]$, where $(g_i)_{i\in I}$ is a family of elements of $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$. The proof of Lemma 2.6 implies that P is liftable and, hence, belongs to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$. But, due to assertion 2 and the exactness of $(-)_{\mathcal{S}}$, the class $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ is closed for cokernels. □

Example 2.8. *Let G be a group, $A = \oplus_{g\in G}A_g$ be a G-graded algebra and $H < G$ be a subgroup. We put $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{U} = H$. Then $A_H = \oplus_{h\in H}A_h$ is in this case a subalgebra of A. Moreover, $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) = (H : H) = \{g \in G : gH = H\} = H$. In this case, $\mathcal{G}(H,H)$ is the full subcategory of Gr_A with objects those graded A-modules M such that $M = M_H A$ and M contains no nonzero graded submodule with support in $G \setminus H$. Our Theorem 2.7 says that the functor $(-)_H : Gr_A \longrightarrow Gr_{A_H}$ establishes equivalences of categories $\mathcal{G}(H,H) \xrightarrow{\cong} Gr_A/\mathcal{T} \xrightarrow{\cong} Gr_{A_H}$, understanding Gr_{A_H} as the category of G-graded A_H-modules with support in H. The reason is that every graded A_H-module X is liftable, because $M =: X \otimes_{A_H} A$ is a graded A-module generated in degrees belonging to H such that $M_H \cong X$.*

3 Pseudomorphisms of groups and regradings

In this section we answer Question 1.2 (see the introduction).

Definition 2. *Let G, G' be groups. A* **pseudomorphism** *$\varphi : G' \longrightarrow G$ is an injective map satisfying the following two properties:*

1. *$\varphi(1) = 1$*
2. *If $\sigma, \tau \in G'$ and $\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau) \in Im(\varphi)$, then $\varphi(\sigma\tau) = \varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau)$*

Proposition 3.1. *Let G', G be groups and $\varphi : G' \longrightarrow G$ be a map. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- *a) φ is a pseudomorphism of groups*
- *b) $1 \in Im(\varphi)$ and, for every G-graded algebra $B = \oplus_{g\in G}B_g$ with support contained in $Im(\varphi)$, putting $\tilde{B} = B$ and $\tilde{B}_\sigma = B_{\varphi(\sigma)}$, for every $\sigma \in G'$, one obtains a G'-graded algebra $\tilde{B}$ coinciding with B as an ungraded algebra*

If B and $\tilde{B}$ are G-graded and G'-graded algebras as in b), then, for every element $g \in G$, there is an equivalence of (abelian) categories between:

1. *The full subcategory $\Sigma_{gIm(\varphi)}$ of Gr_B with objects the graded B-modules X such that $Supp(X) \subseteq gIm(\varphi)$*
2. *The full subcategory $\tilde{\Sigma}_{Im(\varphi)}$ of $Gr_{\tilde{B}}$ with objects the graded $\tilde{B}$-modules V such that $V_\sigma \tilde{B}_\tau = 0$ whenever $\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau) \notin Im(\varphi)$*

Proof. *a)* $\Longrightarrow$ *b)* Let $B = \oplus_{g\in G}B_g$ be any G-graded algebra with $Supp(B) \subseteq Im(\varphi)$, and put $\tilde{B} = B$ and $\tilde{B}_\sigma = B_{\varphi(\sigma)}$, for all $\sigma \in G'$. Then $\tilde{B}_\sigma\tilde{B}_\tau = B_{\varphi(\sigma)}B_{\varphi(\tau)}$ is zero, in case $\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau) \notin Im(\varphi)$, and is an R-submodule of $B_{\varphi(\sigma\tau)} = \tilde{B}_{\sigma\tau}$, in case $\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau) \in Im(\varphi)$. Hence we always have $\tilde{B}_\sigma\tilde{B}_\tau \subseteq \tilde{B}_{\sigma\tau}$, so that $\tilde{B}$ is a G'-graded algebra.

b) $\Longrightarrow$ *a)* Since $1 \in Im(\varphi)$, by taking G-graded algebras concentrated in degree 1, we can ensure that there exist graded G-algebras with support contained in $Im(\varphi)$. Moreover, for any such algebra $B = \oplus_{g\in G}B_g$, the hypothesis says that putting $\tilde{B} = B$ and $\tilde{B}_\sigma = B_{\varphi(\sigma)}$, for every $\sigma \in G'$, we get a G'-graded algebra $\tilde{B}$ coinciding with B as an ungraded algebra. Since the identity of $\tilde{B} = B$ is always a homogeneous element of degree 1, we conclude that $1 \in \tilde{B}_1 = B_{\varphi(1)}$ and $1 \in B_1$. But, by definition of G-grading, the sum $\oplus_{g\in G}B_g$ is direct. It follows that $\varphi(1) = 1$.

On the other hand, if $1 \neq g \in Im(\varphi)$ then we can always find a G-graded algebra B, with $Supp(B) \subseteq Im(\varphi)$, such that $B_g \neq 0$. Indeed, take the algebra $B = R[x]/(x^2)$ with G-grading given by putting $B_1 = R$ and $deg(\bar{x}) = g$. Suppose now that $\sigma, \tau \in G'$ are elements such that $\varphi(\sigma) = \varphi(\tau)$. Then we consider any G-graded algebra B, with $Supp(B) \subseteq Im(\varphi)$, such that $B_{\varphi(\sigma)} \neq 0$. Then we have that $\tilde{B}_\sigma = B_{\varphi(\sigma)} = B_{\varphi(\tau)} = \tilde{B}_\tau$ is nonzero. Then, by definition of G'-grading, we necessarily have $\sigma = \tau$. That proves that φ is injective.

Finally, if $\sigma, \tau \in G'$ and $\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau) \in Im(\varphi)$, then we have $\tilde{B}_\sigma\tilde{B}_\tau = B_{\varphi(\sigma)}B_{\varphi(\tau)} \subseteq B_{\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau)}$ and, since $\tilde{B}$ is a G'-graded algebra, we also have $\tilde{B}_\sigma\tilde{B}_\tau \subseteq \tilde{B}_{\sigma\tau} = B_{\varphi(\sigma\tau)}$. It follows that $\varphi(\sigma\tau) = \varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau)$ unless $B_{\varphi(\sigma)}B_{\varphi(\tau)} = 0$, for every graded G-algebra B with $Supp(B) \subseteq Im(\varphi)$. We should then discard this last possibility, for which we prove that if $g, h \in G \setminus 1$ are elements such that $g, h, gh \in Im(\varphi)$, then there exists a G-graded algebra B, with $Supp(B) \subseteq Im(\varphi)$, such that $B_gB_h \neq 0$. We consider all the possibilities:

i) $g = h$ and $gh = 1$: Take the group algebra $B = RC$, where $C =< g >$ is the subgroup of G generated by g with the obvious G-grading

ii) $g = h$ and $gh \neq 1$: Take $B = R[x]/(x^3)$, $B_1 = R$ and $deg(\bar{x}) = g$

iii) $g \neq h$ and $gh = 1$: Take $B = R < x, y > /(x^2, y^2, yx)$, with $B_1 = R + R\bar{x}\bar{y}$, $deg(\bar{x}) = g$ and $deg(\bar{y}) = h$

iv) $g \neq h$ and $gh \neq 1$: Take $B = R < x, y > /(x^2, y^2, yx)$, with $B_1 = R$, $deg(\bar{x}) = g$ and $deg(\bar{y}) = h$

For the final part, given a subset $\mathcal{X} \subseteq G$, we denote by $\Sigma_{\mathcal{X}}$ the full subcategory of Gr_B with objects those $M \in Gr_B$ such that $Supp(M) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. It is clear that, for every $g \in G$, the shifting equivalence $?[g] : Gr_B \xrightarrow{\cong} Gr_B$ induces by restriction an equivalence $\Sigma_{gIm(\varphi)} \cong \Sigma_{Im(\varphi)}$. So it is not restrictive to assume, something that we do in the rest of the proof, that $g = 1$. Let then $X = \oplus_{g\in G}X_g$ be a graded B-module with $Supp(X) \subseteq Im(\varphi)$. Then we define $\tilde{X} = X$ as ungraded $\tilde{B}$- (or B-)module and give it a structure of G'-graded $\tilde{B}$-module by putting $\tilde{X}_\sigma = X_{\varphi(\sigma)}$, for all $\sigma \in G'$. It is a mere routine to check that the assignment $X \rightsquigarrow \tilde{X}$ defines a fully faithful exact functor $F : \Sigma_{Im(\varphi)} \longrightarrow Gr_{\tilde{B}}$. Moreover, if $\sigma, \tau \in G'$ are elements such that $\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau) \notin Im(\varphi)$, in which case $X_{\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau)} = 0$, then we have $\tilde{X}_\sigma\tilde{B}_\tau = X_{\varphi(\sigma)}B_{\varphi(\tau)} \subseteq X_{\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau)} = 0$, thus proving that $Im(F) \subseteq \tilde{\Sigma}_{Im(\varphi)}$. Conversely, if $V \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{Im(\varphi)}$ then we can form a G-graded B-module X as follows. We put $X = V$ as ungraded $B-$ (or $\tilde{B}-$)module and define $X_g = 0$, when $g \notin Im(\varphi)$, and $X_g = V_\sigma$ provided $g = \varphi(\sigma)$. The injective condition of φ implies that the given G-grading on X is well-defined. We leave to the reader the routinary task of checking that $X \in \Sigma_{Im(\varphi)}$ and $\tilde{X} = V$. From that it follows that F induces the desired equivalence $\Sigma_{Im(\varphi)} \xrightarrow{\cong} \tilde{\Sigma}_{Im(\varphi)}$.

$\square$

It turns out that some of the most interesting ring-supporting subsets of $\mathbf{Z}$ are the image of a pseudomorphism (see next section). It is then of interest to consider the case when $\mathcal{U} \subseteq G$ is a ring-supporting subset such that, for some pseudomorphism $\varphi : G' \longrightarrow G$, one has $Im(\varphi) = \mathcal{U}$. In that situation, starting with any G-graded algebra A, we can take $B = A_{\mathcal{U}}$ in the above proposition, so that we get a G'-graded algebra $\tilde{B} = \tilde{A}_{\mathcal{U}}$. If now $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ is a right modular pair of subsets of G such that $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) \neq \emptyset$ then, according to Proposition 2.4(6), we have $\mathcal{S} = g\mathcal{U} = gIm(\varphi)$, where $g \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$. Moreover, since the objects in the image of the functor $(-)_{\mathcal{S}} : Gr_A \longrightarrow Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ are graded $A_{\mathcal{U}}$-modules with support in $\mathcal{S}$, we get a well-defined R-lineal exact functor $\Phi : Gr_A \longrightarrow Gr_{\tilde{B}}$, which is the following composition $Gr_A \xrightarrow{(-)_{\mathcal{S}}} \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{U}} \hookrightarrow Gr_{\tilde{B}}$, where the central equivalence is that of Proposition 3.1. We now have:

Proposition 3.2. *In the above situation, the following assertions hold:*

1. $H' = \varphi^{-1}[(\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U})]$ *is a subgroup of* G'
2. *The functor* Φ *induces an equivalence of categories between* $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ *and the full subcategory* $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}$ *of* $Gr_{\tilde{B}}$ *consisting of those* $V \in Gr_{\tilde{B}}$ *such that* $V \cong \tilde{X}$*, for some* $X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$.
3. *All* $V \in \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}$ *are graded* $\tilde{B}$*-modules generated in degrees belonging to* H' *and* $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}$ *contains all the graded* $\tilde{B}$*-modules presented in degrees belonging to* H'

Proof. 1) We prove, more generally, that if $\varphi : G' \longrightarrow G$ is a pseudomorphism and $H < G$ is a subgroup contained in $Im(\varphi)$, then $H' = \varphi^{-1}(H)$ is a subgroup of G'.

If $\sigma, \tau \in H'$ then $\varphi(\sigma), \varphi(\tau) \in H$. Since H is a subgroup of G, we have that $\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau) \in H \subseteq Im(\varphi)$. The fact that φ is a pseudomorphism implies that $\varphi(\sigma\tau) = \varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau)$ and, hence, $\sigma\tau \in \varphi^{-1}(H) = H'$.

On the other hand, if $\sigma \in H'$ then $\varphi(\sigma)^{-1} \in H \subseteq Im(\varphi)$ due to the fact that H is a subgroup of G. Then we can choose $\tau \in G'$ such that $\varphi(\sigma)^{-1} = \varphi(\tau)$. But since $\varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau) = 1 \in Im(\varphi)$, we get that $\varphi(1) = 1 = \varphi(\sigma)\varphi(\tau) = \varphi(\sigma\tau)$. The fact that φ is injective implies that $1 = \sigma\tau$. Then $\tau = \sigma^{-1}$ and hence $\sigma^{-1} \in H' = \varphi^{-1}(H)$. That proves that H' is a subgroup of G'.

2) According to the definition of Φ and Theorem 2.7, we get equivalences $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}$.

3) Put $B = A_{\mathcal{U}}$. Then, as shown in the proof of Proposition 3.1, the equivalence $\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} = \Sigma_{gIm(\varphi)} \xrightarrow{\cong} \tilde{\Sigma}_{Im(\varphi)} = \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is a composition $\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} \xrightarrow{[g]} \Sigma_{\mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{U}}$,

where the second equivalence takes graded B-modules generated (resp. presented) in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U})$ to graded $\tilde{B}$-modules generated (resp. presented) in degrees belonging to $H' = \varphi^{-1}[(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U})]$. On the other hand, the first equivalence $[g] : \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \Sigma_{\mathcal{U}}$ takes graded B-modules generated (resp. presented) in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{U})$ to graded B-modules generated (resp. presented) in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U})$. Now, from the chain of inclusions $\{X \in Gr_B : X$ presented in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{U})\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{U}) \subseteq \{X \in Gr_B : X$ generated in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{U})\} \subseteq \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}$ (cf. Theorem 2.7), assertion 3 follows.

□

4 The case $G = \mathbf{Z}$

In this section we particularize the previous arguments to $G = \mathbf{Z}$, the additive group of integers. We thereby shift from multiplicative to additive notation, and our algebra will be a $\mathbf{Z}$-graded algebra $A = \oplus_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} A_i$. Our first goal is to get as much information as possible on ring-supporting subsets $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}$ and hence, by Proposition 2.4, on modular pairs $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ such that $\emptyset \neq (\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{U}) =: \{m \in \mathbf{Z} : m + \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{S}\}$. Those modular pairs will be of the form $(m+\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U})$, for some integer m.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}$ be a subset containing 0 such that $(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U}) = n\mathbf{Z}$, and let $p : \mathbf{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Z}_n$ be the canonical projection. The following assertions are equivalent:*

1. *$\mathcal{U}$ is a ring-supporting subset of $\mathbf{Z}$*
2. *$\bar{\mathcal{U}} = p(\mathcal{U})$ is a ring-supporting subset of $\mathbf{Z}_n$ such that $(\bar{\mathcal{U}}:\bar{\mathcal{U}}) = \{\bar{0}\}$*

In that case $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{i\in\bar{\mathcal{U}}}(n\mathbf{Z}+i)$, viewing $\bar{\mathcal{U}}$ as a subset of $[0,n)$ in case $n>0$.

Proof. We put $\bar{m} = p(m)$, for every $m \in \mathbf{Z}$. Let us first notice that $p^{-1}(\bar{m} + \bar{\mathcal{U}})) = m+\mathcal{U}$. Indeed, if $v \in p^{-1}(\bar{m}+\bar{\mathcal{U}}))$ then $\bar{v} = p(v) = \bar{m}+\bar{u}$, for some $u \in \mathcal{U}$, which implies that $v-m-u \in n\mathbf{Z} = (\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U})$. Then $v = m+u+(v-m-u) \in m+(v-m-u)+\mathcal{U}$. But $(v-m-u)+\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}$, and then $v \in m+\mathcal{U}$ as desired. In particular $m+\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}$ iff $\bar{m}+\bar{\mathcal{U}} = \bar{\mathcal{U}}$. In other words, $m \in (\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U})$ iff $\bar{m} \in (\bar{\mathcal{U}}:\bar{\mathcal{U}})$. That gives that $(\bar{\mathcal{U}}:\bar{\mathcal{U}}) = \{\bar{0}\}$.

1) $\Longrightarrow$ 2) If $u,v,w \in \mathcal{U}$ are elements such that $\bar{u}+\bar{v}+\bar{w} \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}$ or, equivalently, $u+v+w \in \mathcal{U}$ then $\bar{u}+\bar{v} = \overline{u+v} \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}$ iff $u+v \in \mathcal{U}$. Since $\mathcal{U}$ is ring-supporting, the latter happens iff $v+w \in \mathcal{U}$ iff $\overline{v+w} = \bar{v}+\bar{w} \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}$. Therefore $\bar{\mathcal{U}}$ is a ring-supporting subset of $\mathbf{Z}_n$.

2) $\Longrightarrow$ 1) Go backward in the other implication.

Since $p^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{U}}) = \mathcal{U}$, we immediately get $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{i\in\bar{\mathcal{U}}}(n\mathbf{Z}+i)$, thus ending the proof.

□

Theorem 4.2. *Let* $\mathcal{U}$ *be a ring-supporting subset of* $\mathbf{Z}$ *such that* $(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U}) = n\mathbf{Z}$. *Then* $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{j\in J}(n\mathbf{Z}+j)$, *where* J *is a ring-supporting subset of* $\mathbf{Z}_n$ *such that* $(J:J) = J\cap(-J) = \{\bar{0}\}$. *Moreover, the following assertions hold:*

1. *If* $\mathcal{U}$ *contains an infinite interval then exactly one of the following conditions hold:*
   - *(a)* $\mathcal{U} = \mathbf{Z} = (\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U})$
   - *(b)* $\mathcal{U}$ *is an additive submonoid of* $\mathbf{N}$
   - *(c)* $\mathcal{U}$ *is an additive submonoid of* $-\mathbf{N}$
2. *If* $\mathcal{U}$ *does not contain an infinite interval, then* $\mathcal{U}$ *is a union* $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{i\in I}[a_i, b_i]$ *of finite intervals such that* $a_i \le b_i < a_{i+1}-1$ *for all* $i \in I$, *where the index set* I *is an interval of* $\mathbf{Z}$. *Moreover, the interval* $[a_{i_0}, b_{i_0}]$ *containing* 0 *is either* $[0,r]$ *or* $[-r,0]$, *for some natural number* r *which, in case* $n > 1$, *satisfies that* $2r < n$

Proof. The first part of the theorem follows directly from Lemma 4.1. To prove assertion 1, notice that, since $(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U})$ is a subgroup of $\mathbf{Z}$ contained in $\mathcal{U}$, one has that $(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U}) = \mathbf{Z}$ if and only if $\mathcal{U} = \mathbf{Z}$. So in the rest of the proof we assume that $\mathcal{U}$ is a proper subset of $\mathbf{Z}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{U}$ contains an infinite interval $[m, +\propto)$. If $m < 0$ then the subgroup $(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U}) = \mathcal{U}\cap(-\mathcal{U})$ contains the interval $[m, -m]$, which contains 1. That implies that $(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U}) = \mathbf{Z} = \mathcal{U}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $m \ge 0$ and we choose m minimal with the property that $[m, +\propto) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. Notice that if $m > 0$ then $m > 1$, because $0 \in \mathcal{U}$. We also have $(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U}) = 0$, for otherwise the subgroup $(\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U})$ would be lower and upper unbounded and then $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U}) + [m, +\propto) \subseteq (\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U}) + \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}$, which contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{U}$ is proper. Then $\mathcal{U}\cap(-\mathcal{U}) = (\mathcal{U}:\mathcal{U}) = 0$ and, in particular, $(-\propto, -m]\cap\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ unless $m = 0$, in which case that intersection is $\{0\}$. Then $\mathcal{U} \subseteq [-m, +\propto)$. In order to prove that $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbf{N}$ it will be enough to consider the case $m > 1$ and prove that $(-m, 0)\cap\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$. Indeed, if that intersection is nonempty, then we can take $k > 0$ such that $-k = Inf[(-m,0)\cap\mathcal{U}]$. We choose now $u = v = -k$ and $w = m+2k$. Then u, v, w and $u+v+w = m$ belong to $\mathcal{U}$. However $v + w = m + k \in \mathcal{U}$ while $u + v = -2k \notin \mathcal{U}$. That contradicts the ring-supporting condition of $\mathcal{U}$. Therefore $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbf{N}$. We finally check that $\mathcal{U}$ is an additive submonoid of $\mathbf{N}$. Suppose that it is not the case, so that there are $u, v \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $u + v \notin \mathcal{U}$. Then, taking $w = m$, we get that $u, v, w \in \mathcal{U}$ and $u+v+w \ge m$, so that also $u+v+w \in \mathcal{U}$. But now $v+w = m+v \in [m, +\propto) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and $u + v \notin \mathcal{U}$. That contradicts the ring-supporting condition of $\mathcal{U}$.

Since $-\mathcal{U}$ is a ring-supporting subset whenever so is $\mathcal{U}$ (cf. Proposition 2.4), the above paragraph also gives that if $(-\propto, -m] \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, for some $m \in \mathbf{Z}$, then $\mathcal{U}$ is an additive submonoid of $-\mathbf{N}$.

Suppose now that $\mathcal{U}$ does not contain infinite intervals. We can always express it as a union $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{i\in I}[a_i, b_i]$ of finite intervals such that $a_i \le b_i < a_{i+1}-1$ for all $i \in I$, where the index set I is an interval of the integers which we convene that contains 0 and, in addition $0 \in [a_0, b_0]$. Suppose now that $a_0 < 0$

and $b_0 > 0$. We then take $u = a_0$, $v = -1$, $w = 1$. Then $u, v, w \in [a_0, b_0] \subset \mathcal{U}$, and also $u + v + w = u \in \mathcal{U}$. Now $v + w = 0 \in \mathcal{U}$ but $u + v = a_0 - 1 \notin \mathcal{U}$. That contradicts the ring-supporting condition of $\mathcal{U}$. Therefore either $a_0 = 0$ or $b_0 = 0$, so that we can assume that $[a_0, b_0] = [0, r]$ or $[a_0, b_0] = [-r, 0]$, for some natural number r. It only remains to prove that, in case $n > 1$, we have $2r < n$. We do it when $[a_0, b_0] = [0, r]$, leaving the dualization when $[a_0, b_0] = [-r, 0]$ for the reader. Since $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$ is a proper subset of $\mathbf{Z}_n \cong [0, n)$, we necessarily have $r < n - 1$. Suppose now that $2r \geq n$. Then we take $u = n - r$, $v = r$ and $w = 1$. Since $0 < n - r \leq 2r - r = r$, and $u + v + w = n + 1$, we conclude that u, v, w and $u + v + w$ belong to $\mathcal{U}$. Now $u + v = n \in \mathcal{U}$, but $v + w = r + 1 \notin \mathcal{U}$ because $r = b_0 < a_1 - 1$. That contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{U}$ is ring-supporting and, hence, we necessarily have $2r < n$.

□

Remark 4.3. *From the above result we deduce that, in order to classify all the ring-supporting subsets of* $\mathbf{Z}$*, one should classify all the ring-supporting subsets* $\mathcal{U}$ *such that* $(\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U}) = 0$ *and, for every* $n > 0$*, all the ring-supporting subsets* $J \subset \mathbf{Z}_n$ *such that* $(J : J) = \{\bar{0}\}$*. It seems to be a very difficult task, and the only reasonable expectation is to tackle the case when* $n > 0$ *is not large. The following is a sample. We leave the verification to the reader.*

Examples 4.4. *The following are the ring-supporting subsets* $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}$ *such that* $(\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U}) = n\mathbf{Z}$*, with* $0 < n \leq 5$

1. *If* $n = 1$ *then* $\mathcal{U} = \mathbf{Z}$
2. *If* $n = 2$ *then* $\mathcal{U} = 2\mathbf{Z} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [2k, 2k]$
3. *If* $n = 3$ *then* $\mathcal{U}$ *is one of the subsets* $3\mathbf{Z} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [3k, 3k]$*,* $3\mathbf{Z} \cup (3\mathbf{Z} + 1) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [3k, 3k + 1]$ *or* $3\mathbf{Z} \cup (3\mathbf{Z} + 2) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [3k - 1, 3k]$
4. *If* $n = 4$ *then* $\mathcal{U}$ *is one of the subsets* $4\mathbf{Z} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [4k, 4k]$*,* $4\mathbf{Z} \cup (4\mathbf{Z} + 1) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [4k, 4k + 1]$ *or* $4\mathbf{Z} \cup (4\mathbf{Z} + 3) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [4k - 1, 4k]$
5. *If* $n = 5$ *then* $\mathcal{U}$ *is one of the subsets of the following list:*
   - *a)* $5\mathbf{Z} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [5k, 5k]$
   - *b)* $5\mathbf{Z} \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 1) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [5k, 5k + 1]$
   - *b*)* $5\mathbf{Z} \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 4) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [5k - 1, 5k]$
   - *c)* $5\mathbf{Z} \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 1) \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 2) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [5k, 5k + 2]$
   - *c*)* $5\mathbf{Z} \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 3) \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 4) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [5k - 2, 5k]$
   - *d)* $5\mathbf{Z} \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 2) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} ([5k, 5k] \cup [5k + 2, 5k + 2])$
   - *d*)* $5\mathbf{Z} \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 3) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} ([5k, 5k] \cup [5k + 3, 5k + 3])$
   - *e)* $5\mathbf{Z} \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 1) \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 3) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} ([5k, 5k + 1] \cup [5k + 3, 5k + 3])$
   - *e*)* $5\mathbf{Z} \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 2) \cup (5\mathbf{Z} + 4) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} ([5k - 1, 5k] \cup [5k + 2, 5k + 2])$

The last part of Theorem 4.2 gives the following peculiar ring-supporting subset, which will be called **translation of an interval** in the sequel:

Corollary 4.5. *Let* $\mathcal{U}$ *be a subset of* $\mathbf{Z}$ *containing* 0 *such that* $(\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U}) = n\mathbf{Z}$, *with* $n \neq 0, 1$. *The following assertions are equivalent:*

1. $\mathcal{U}$ *is ring-supporting and* $\mathcal{U} = I + n\mathbf{Z}$, *for some finite interval* $I \subset \mathbf{Z}$
2. $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}}[nk, nk + r]$ *or* $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}}[nk - r, nk]$, *for some natural number* r *such that* $2r < n$

Proof. Theorem 4.2 gives the implication 1) $\Longrightarrow$ 2). For the converse, it will enough to check that $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}}[nk, nk + r]$ is ring-supporting and, for that, we will check that $\bar{\mathcal{U}}$ is a ring-supporting subset of $\mathbf{Z}_n$. Indeed, if u, v, w are natural numbers such that $u, v, w \leq r$ and we assume that $\bar{u} + \bar{v} + \bar{w} \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}$, then, since $u + v \leq 2r < n$, we have that either $u + v + w \leq r$ or $n \leq u + v + w \leq n + r$. In the first case, both $u + v \leq r$ and $v + w \leq r$. In the second case, both $u + v > r$ and $v + w > r$ for if, say, $u + v \leq r$ then $u + v + w \leq r + r = 2r < n$, against the assumption that $u + v + w \in [n, n + r]$. Therefore $\bar{u} + \bar{v} \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}$ if, and only if, $\bar{v} + \bar{w} \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}$, as desired. □

In the rest of the section, we assume that our algebra is a positively graded algebra $A = \oplus_{i \geq 0} A_i$ over a field K, which is generated in degrees $0, 1$ and has the property that A_0 is semisimple. The symbol $\otimes$ will always mean tensor product over A_0.

In case $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ is a right modular pair of subsets of $\mathbf{Z}$ and $X \in Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ has $Supp(X) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, we denote by $\mu_{s,u} : X_s \otimes A_u \longrightarrow X_{s+u}$ the multiplication map, whenever $(s, u) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{U}$ and $s + u \in \mathcal{S}$. Since $X \otimes A$ is a graded right A-module, $Ker(\mu_{s,u})A_i$ is a well-defined A_0-submodule of $X_s \otimes A_{u+i}$, for all $i \geq 0$. With this terminology in mind, we can give criteria for X to be liftable.

Proposition 4.6. *Let* $A = \oplus_{i \geq 0} A_i$ *be a positively graded algebra generated in degrees* $0, 1$, *with* A_0 *semisimple,* $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U})$ *be a right modular pair of subsets of* $\mathbf{Z}$ *and consider an* $X \in Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ *generated in degrees belonging to* $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$. *The following assertions are equivalent:*

1. X *is liftable with respect to the functor* $(-)_{\mathcal{S}} : Gr_A \longrightarrow Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$
2. $Ker(\mu_{m,u})A_{v-u} \subseteq Ker(\mu_{m,v})$ *whenever* $(m, u, v) \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}$ *is a triple such that* $0 \leq u < v$ *and* $v - u \notin \mathcal{U}$

Proof. 1) $\Longrightarrow$ 2) Take $M \in Gr_A$ such that $M_{\mathcal{S}} = X$. Then, for all $(m, u) \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) \times \mathcal{U}$, the multiplication maps $\mu_{m,u} : X_m \otimes A_u = M_m \otimes A_u \longrightarrow M_{m+u} = X_{m+u}$ are those of the A-module M. Now condition 2 follows from the associative property of the multiplication for the A-module M

2) $\Longrightarrow$ 1) When $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) = \emptyset$ there is nothing to prove. Hence, we assume that $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) \neq \emptyset$. Since X is generated in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$, the multiplication map $\mu : X_{(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{U})} \otimes A_{\mathcal{U}} \longrightarrow X$ is surjective and $Supp(X) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. We

then consider the graded A-module $M = \frac{X_{(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{U})} \otimes A}{(Ker\mu)A}$. Then $M_{\mathcal{S}} = \frac{(X_{(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{U})} \otimes A)_{\mathcal{S}}}{[(Ker\mu)A]_{\mathcal{S}}} = \frac{X_{(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{U})} \otimes A_{\mathcal{U}}}{[(Ker\mu)A]_{\mathcal{S}}}$. We shall prove that $[(Ker\mu)A]_{\mathcal{S}} = Ker\mu$ and the result will follow, for $\frac{X_{(\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{U})} \otimes A_{\mathcal{U}}}{Ker\mu}$ is isomorphic to X in $Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$. Let us fix $t \in \mathcal{S}$. Then the t-homogeneous component of $(Ker\mu)A$ is $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}, s \leq t} (Ker\mu)_s A_{t-s}$. The task is whence reduced to prove that if $s \leq t$ are elements of $\mathcal{S}$ then $(Ker\mu)_s A_{t-s} \subseteq (Ker\mu)_t$. That inclusion is clear in case $t - s \in \mathcal{U}$ due to the associative property of the multiplication in the $A_{\mathcal{U}}$-module X. So we assume that $t - s \notin \mathcal{U}$. Let $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} x_i \otimes a_i$ belong to $(Ker\mu)_s$, where $deg(x_i) = m_i \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$ and $a_i \in A_{s-m_i}$ for $i = 1, ..., r$. We take $p = max\{m \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) : m \leq s\}$. The hypothesis on A implies that $A_{s-m_i} = A_{p-m_i} \cdot A_{s-p}$, so that $a_i = \sum_j b_{ij} c_{ij}$, where $b_{ij} \in A_{p-m_i}$ and $c_{ij} \in A_{s-p}$, for all i, j. Then $0 = \sum_i x_i a_i = \sum_{i,j} x_i (b_{ij} c_{ij}) = \sum_{i,j} (x_i b_{ij}) c_{ij}$, using the associative property of X again (notice that $deg(b_{ij}) = p - m_i$ and $deg(c_{ij}) = s - p$ belong to $\mathcal{U}$). Then $\sum_{i,j} (x_i b_{ij}) \otimes c_{ij}$ belongs to the kernel of the multiplication map $\mu_{p,s-p} : X_p \otimes A_{s-p} \longrightarrow A_s$. Since $p \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$, we have that $u = s - p$ and $v = t - p$ are elements of $\mathcal{U}$ such that $0 \leq u < v$ and $v - u = t - s \notin \mathcal{U}$. Our hypothesis says that $Ker(\mu_{p,s-p}) A_{t-s} \subseteq Ker(\mu_{p,t-p})$. Then, if $d \in A_{t-s}$ the element $\sum_{i,j} (x_i b_{ij}) \otimes (c_{ij} d)$ belongs to $Ker(\mu_{p,t-p})$. That gives $0 = \sum_{i,j} (x_i b_{ij})(c_{ij} d) = \sum_{i,j} x_i [b_{ij}(c_{ij} d)]$, using the associative property of the multiplication in X. But the associative property of A gives that $b_{ij}(c_{ij} d) = (b_{ij} c_{ij}) d$. Hence we have $0 = \sum_{i,j} x_i [(b_{ij} c_{ij}) d] = \sum_i x_i (a_i d)$, which implies that the element $(\sum_i x_i \otimes a_i) d$ belongs to $(Ker\mu)_t$. That proves that $(Ker\mu_s) A_{t-s} \subseteq (Ker\mu)_t$, as desired.

□

The conditions get much simpler in the case that we are more interested in, namely, the translation of an interval (cf. Corollary 4.5).

Corollary 4.7. *In the situation of the proposition, adopting the notations of Corollary 4.5, suppose that* $\mathcal{U}$ *is the translation of an interval. Then the following assertions hold for a graded* $A_{\mathcal{U}}$*-module* X *generated in degrees belonging to* $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$*:*

1. *If* $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [kn, kn + r]$ *(*$0 \leq 2r < n$*), then* X *is liftable if, and only if,* $Ker(\mu_{m,r}) A_{n-r} \subseteq Ker(\mu_{m,n})$*, for all* $m \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$
2. *If* $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} [kn - r, kn]$ *(*$0 \leq 2r < n$*), then* X *is liftable if, and only if,* $Ker(\mu_{m,u}) A_{v-u} \subseteq Ker(\mu_{m,v})$*, for all* $m \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$ *and all* $n - r \leq u < v \leq n$

Proof. We prove 1, for which we only need to check the 'if' part. The proof of assertion 2 follows a similar pattern. We first prove by induction on $k \geq 0$ that $Ker(\mu_{m,kn+r}) A_{n-r} \subseteq Ker(\mu_{m,(k+1)n})$ (*), for all $m \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$. The case $k = 0$ is just the hypothesis. Suppose now that $k > 0$ and $\sum_i x_i \otimes a_i \in Ker(\mu_{m,kn+r})$, where $x_i \in X_m$ and $a_i \in A_{kn+r}$ for all indices i. Since $A_{kn+r} = A_n \cdot A_{(k-1)n+r}$, we can decompose $a_i = \sum_j b_{ij} c_{ij}$, where $b_{ij} \in A_n$ and $c_{ij} \in A_{(k-1)n+r}$. With an argument similar to that in the proof of Proposition 4.6, we see that $\sum_{i,j}(x_ib_{ij}) \otimes c_{ij}$ belongs to $Ker(\mu_{m+n,(k-1)n+r})$. If now $d \in A_{n-r}$ then the induction hypothesis says that $(\sum_{i,j}(x_ib_{ij}) \otimes c_{ij})d = \sum_{i,j}(x_ib_{ij}) \otimes (c_{ij}d)$ belongs to $Ker(\mu_{m+n,kn})$ and, as in the proof of Proposition 4.6 again, one sees that $(\sum_i x_i \otimes a_i)d = \sum_i x_i \otimes (a_id) \in Ker(\mu_{m,(k+1)n})$.

Let $(m,u,v) \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}$ be a triple such that $0 \leq u < v$ and $v - u \notin \mathcal{U}$. Then we have $u \in [a_i, b_i] = [in, in + r]$ and $v \in [a_j, b_j] = [jn, jn + r]$, for some indices $0 \leq i < j$. Since A is generated in degrees $0, 1$, we have that $A_{v-u} = A_{b_i - u} \cdot A_{a_{i+1} - b_i} \cdot ... \cdot A_{a_j - b_{j-1}} \cdot A_{v - a_j}$. Each of the factors of this product is of the form $A_{v'-u'}$, where either $u', v' \in [a_k, b_k] = [kn, kn + r]$ or $u' = b_k = kn + r$, $v' = a_{k+1} = (k+1)n$, for some index k. In the first case $0 \leq v' - u' \leq r$ and, hence, $v' - u' \in \mathcal{U}$. In the second case, $v' - u' = n - r$. One then obtains that $Ker(\mu_{m,u})A_{v-u} \subseteq Ker(\mu_{m,v})$ by recursive use of the associative property of the $A_{\mathcal{U}}$-module X and the above condition (*). □

Using Theorem 2.7, we have the following straightforward consequence:

Corollary 4.8. *Let $A = \oplus_{i \geq 0} A_i$ be a positively graded algebra generated in degrees $0, 1$ such that A_0 is semisimple. We consider $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}}[nk, nk + r]$ and $\mathcal{S} = m + \mathcal{U}$, where $n > 1$, $0 \leq 2r < n$ and $m \in \mathbf{Z}$. The functor $(-)_{\mathcal{S}} : Gr_A \longrightarrow Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ establishes an equivalence between the following categories:*

1. *The full subcategory $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ of Gr_A whose objects are the graded modules generated in degrees belonging to $m + n\mathbf{Z}$ and cogenerated in degrees belonging to $\mathcal{S}$*
2. *The full subcategory $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ of $Gr_{A_{\mathcal{U}}}$ whose objects are those X generated in degrees belonging to $m + n\mathbf{Z}$ and satisfying that $(Ker\mu_{m+kn,r})A_{n-r} \subseteq Ker\mu_{m+kn,n}$ for all $k \in \mathbf{Z}$*

By the induction principle, given a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}$, which is neiter upper nor lower bounded, and a fixed element $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, there is a unique strictly increasing map $\delta = \delta_{(\mathcal{S},s_0)} : \mathbf{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ such that $\delta(0) = s_0$ and $Im(\delta) = \mathcal{S}$.

Let $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ be a right modular pair of subsets of $\mathbf{Z}$ such that $0 \neq (\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U}) = n\mathbf{Z}$ and $m \in (\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U})$. We want to identify $\delta_{(\mathcal{S},m)}$. As in Lemma 4.1, we can think of $\bar{\mathcal{U}}$ as a subset of $[0, n)$, in which case we can write $\bar{\mathcal{U}} = \{i_0, i_1, ..., i_{t-1}\}$, with $t = |\bar{\mathcal{U}}|$ and $0 = i_0 < i_1 < ... < i_{t-1} < n$.

Lemma 4.9. *In the above situation, the following assertions hold:*

1. $\delta_{(\mathcal{S},m)} = m + \delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)}$
2. $\delta_{(\mathcal{S},m)} : \mathbf{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ *maps* $tj + k \rightsquigarrow m + nj + i_k$, *for all* $j \in \mathbf{Z}$ *and all* $k \in [0, t)$
3. *If $\mathcal{U}$ is the translation of an interval, then $\delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)}$ is a pseudomorphism of groups.*

Proof. 1) Clearly, $m + \delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)} : j \rightsquigarrow m + \delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)}(j)$ is strictly increasing and maps $0 \rightsquigarrow m + \delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)}(0) = m$. Moreover, $Im(m + \delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)}) = m + Im(\delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)}) = m + \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{S}$. Then $\delta_{(\mathcal{S},m)} = m + \delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)}$.

2) Use an argument as in 1.

3) We then prove that $\delta =: \delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)}$ is a pseudomorphism in case $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbf{Z}}[nk, nk+r]$ or $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbf{Z}}[nk-r, nk]$, where r and n are natural numbers such that $0 \leq 2r < n$. We consider the second possibility, leaving the first one as an exercise. Notice that $t = |\bar{\mathcal{U}}| = r+1$ in this case. Then, according to assertion 2, we have $\delta[(r+1)j-i] = nj-i$, for all $j \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $i \in [0,r]$. If $m = (r+1)j-i$ and $m' = (r+1)j'-i'$, where $i, i' \in [0,r]$, then $\delta(m)+\delta(m') = n(j+j')-i-i'$ belongs to $\mathcal{U} = Im(\delta)$ if, and only if, $i+i' \in [0,r]$. In that case, $\delta(m+m') = \delta[(r+1)(j+j')-(i+i')] = n(j+j')-(i+i') = \delta(m)+\delta(m')$. Then δ is a pseudomorphism of groups. □

We can now combine the general results of Sections 2 and 3 with those of this section. If $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbf{Z}}[nk, nk+r]$, with $0 < 2r < n$, then we consider the graded algebra $\tilde{B}$ obtained from $B =: A_{\mathcal{U}}$ by regrading along the pseudomorphism $\delta = \delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)}$. If now $V \in Gr_{\tilde{B}}$, then we have a multiplication maps $\tilde{\mu}_{(r+1)k,r} : V_{(r+1)k}\otimes\tilde{B}_r = V_{(r+1)k}\otimes A_r \longrightarrow V_{(r+1)(k+1)-1}$ and $\tilde{\mu}_{(r+1)k,r+1} : V_{(r+1)k}\otimes\tilde{B}_{r+1} = V_{(r+1)k}\otimes A_n \longrightarrow V_{(r+1)(k+1)}$, so that, working in the right A-module $V_{(r+1)\mathbf{Z}}\otimes A$, it makes sense to consider $Ker(\tilde{\mu})_{(r+1)k,r}A_{n-r}$, which will be $A_0 - A_0-$sub-bimodule of $V_{(r+1)k}\otimes\tilde{B}_{r+1} = V_{(r+1)k}\otimes A_n$. We then get the following:

Corollary 4.10. *Let $A = \oplus_{n\geq 0}A_n$ be a positively graded algebra generated in degrees $0,1$ such that A_0 is semisimple, $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U}) = (m+\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U})$ be a right modular pair, where $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbf{Z}}[nk, nk+r]$, with $0 \leq 2r < n$, and $\tilde{B}$ be the graded algebra obtained from $B = A_{\mathcal{U}}$ by regrading along the pseudomorphism $\delta = \delta_{(\mathcal{U},0)} : \mathbf{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Z}$. The functor $\Phi : Gr_A \longrightarrow Gr_{\tilde{B}}$ of Proposition 3.2 gives an equivalence of categories between:*

1. *The full subcategory $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ of Gr_A whose objects are the graded A-modules generated in degrees belonging to $(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U}) = m + n\mathbf{Z}$ and co-generated in degrees belonging to $\mathcal{S}$*

2. *The full subcategory $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}$ of $Gr_{\tilde{B}}$ consisting of those V generated in degrees belonging to $(r+1)\mathbf{Z}$ such that $Ker(\tilde{\mu}_{(r+1)k,r})A_{n-r} \subseteq Ker(\tilde{\mu}_{(r+1)k,r+1})$, for all $k \in \mathbf{Z}$.*

Moreover, $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}$ contains all the graded $\tilde{B}$-modules presented in degrees belonging to $(r+1)\mathbf{Z}$.

Proof. It is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 4.8, after checking that the equivalence $\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} = \Sigma_{m+Im(\delta)} \xrightarrow{\cong} \tilde{\Sigma}_{Im(\delta)} = \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{U}}$ of Proposition 3.1 restricts to an equivalence between $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}$. □

Remark 4.11. *If Λ is a n-Koszul algebra, with $n > 2$, then we can apply the above corollary to $A = \Lambda^!$, with $r = 1$, so that $\tilde{B} \cong E = E(\Lambda)$ is the Yoneda algebra of Λ (cf. [5][Theorem 9.1], see also [3][Proposition 3.1]) and $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U}) = (m+\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U})$, with $\mathcal{U} = n\mathbf{Z} \cup (n\mathbf{Z}+1)$. Hence, if $V \in Gr_E$, we have multiplication maps $\tilde{\mu}_{2k,1} : V_{2k}\otimes E_1 = V_{2k}\otimes\Lambda^!_1 \longrightarrow V_{2k+1}$ and $\tilde{\mu}_{2k,2} : V_{2k}\otimes E_2 =$*

$V_{2k} \otimes \Lambda^!_n \longrightarrow V_{2k+2}$ and we can take $Ker(\tilde{\mu}_{2k,1})\Lambda^!_{n-1}$, which is a $\Lambda_0 - \Lambda_0-$sub-bimodule of $V_{2k} \otimes \Lambda^!_n = V_{2k} \otimes E_2$. The last corollary gives then an equivalence of categories between:

1. *The full subcategory $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{U})$ of $Gr_{\Lambda^!}$ consisting of those M such that $M = M_{m+n\mathbf{Z}}\Lambda^!$ and, for every graded submodule $0 \neq N < M$, one has $N_{\mathcal{S}} \neq 0$*
2. *The full subcategory $\mathcal{L}_E$ of Gr_E consisting of those $V \in Gr_E$ which are generated in even degrees and satisfy that $Ker(\tilde{\mu}_{2k,1})\Lambda^!_{n-1} \subseteq Ker(\tilde{\mu}_{2k,2})$, for all $k \in \mathbf{Z}$.*

Moreover, $\mathcal{L}_E$ contains all the graded E-modules presented in even degrees.

References

[1] AUSLANDER, M.; REITEN, I.; SMALO, S.O.: "Representation theory of Artin algebras". Cambridge Univ. Press **36**, in Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge (1995).

[2] BERGER, R.: Koszulity for nonquadratic algebras. J. Algebra **239** (2001), 705-734.

[3] BERGER, R.; MARCONNET, N.: Koszul and Gorenstein properties for homogeneous algebras. Preprint, arXiv: math.QA/0310070 v2

[4] GABRIEL, P.: Des catégories abeliennes. Bull. Soc. Math. France, **90** (1962), 323-448

[5] GREEN, E.L.; MARCOS, E.N.; MARTINEZ-VILLA, R.; ZHANG, P.: D-Koszul algebras. J. Pure and Appl. Algebra **193** (2004), 141-162

[6] NASTASESCU, C.; VAN OYSTAEYEN, F.: "Graded Ring Theory". North-Holland (1982)

[7] STENSTRÖM, B.: "Rings os quotients". Springer-Verlag (1975)